

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached (4) sheets of drawings are formal drawings to replace the non-formal drawings.

Attachments: Replacement sheets

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 14-18, 20-23 and 26-30 are now present in this application. Claims 1-13, 19, 24 and 25 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Drawings Objections

The replacement sheets of drawings received on January 28, 2008 have been disapproved. The Examiner indicated that sheet one had two vertical lines not forming part of the drawings and sheets two and three each had a similar line. These lines are apparently the result of the scanning process at the PTO and new replacement sheets have been submitted with this response. No new matter has been added.

The drawings are objected to as not showing the production unit as a "floating unit" as recited in claim 19, the trusswork of claim 24 and the partly closed arrangement of claim 25. By this amendment, these claims are cancelled.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 14-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In claim 14, the Examiner found the recitation "the mooring devices have a mooring rigidity for the loading buoy in the range of 20-75% of the waterline rigidity for the structure" to be unclear. The Examiner stated that the mooring lines are not connected to the loading buoy but to the surface element and questioned how the rigidity of the mooring lines could be compared to the rigidity of the floating structure. The Examiner found the same ambiguity in claims 15, 16, 21 and 22.

By this amendment, the phrase has been amended to "the mooring devices have a vertical mooring rigidity in the range 20-75% of the waterline rigidity for the structure." The surface element 2 is part of the loading buoy 1 so that the mooring lines are connected to the loading

buoy. The rigidity of the mooring lines is not compared to the rigidity of the floating structure, as stated by the Examiner but the vertical mooring rigidity of the mooring device is compared to the water plane rigidity of the structure. The water line rigidity is defined in the specification in the first paragraph of page 5.

The Examiner noted that claims 15 and 16 depended from canceled claims. These claims have been amended to depend from claim 14.

The Examiner found the term "it" in claims 15, 16 and 21-23 to be unclear. Accordingly, the term "it" has been replaced with "the floating structure" in these claims.

The Examiner also questioned whether the term "draught" is in terms of volume or area. Draught, now amended to be draft, is well known to be the depth of water needed to float a ship. The last paragraph of page three discloses "[t]he surface element has a vertical height and a part thereof is arranged down in the body of water, forming a draught of the surface element."

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 14-18, 20-23 and 26-30 are definite and clear. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has not rejected the claims in view of the prior art. Therefore, it is believed that claims 14-18, 20-23 and 26-30 are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, the present application should now be allowed. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Because the prior art cited by the Examiner has been included merely to show the state of prior art and is not being utilized to reject the claims, no further comments concerning these documents are considered necessary at this time.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No. 10/591,859
Amendment dated September 9, 2008
Reply to Office Action dated May 9, 2008


Docket No.: 1380-0229PUS1

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petition for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 9, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By  #61007
for Paul C. Lewis
Registration No.: 43,368
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

Attachments: Four (4) sheets of corrected drawings